REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner commented that acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for priority based on 35 U.S.C. §371 of Dec. 5, 2000. (Office Action, pg. 2) Applicants have not made any claim for priority in this case. Further, the date of Dec. 5, 2000 is the date the application was filed in the U.S., not a foreign priority date.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9-11, and 14-16 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over the article "How to Write and Use ActiveX Controls for Microsoft Windows CE 2.1 (Microsoft, June 1999) (referred to herein as"Microsoft") in view of "Flexi Web Strategy Targets ActiveX First, Java Maybe" (Copyright 1996, Washington Post Newsweek Interactive) (referred to herein as "Flexi"). Applicants traverse these rejections for the following reasons.

Claim 1 concerns transferring data from a first server to a second server through a client computer over a network, and requires that the client computer performs: downloading and displaying content in a first page from the first server; downloading and displaying content in a second page from the second server including transfer data to communicate to the first server; displaying the transfer data with the content from the first page; and communicating the transfer data to the first server.

The Examiner cited pg. 1, lines 22-23 of Flexi. This cited section states that ActiveX will provide the ability to download components and that the downloaded objects persist on the desktop after the session. (Office Action, pg. 3) Nowhere does the cited Flexi anywhere teach or suggest the specific claim requirements that the client computer download and display a first and second pages from a first and second servers, respectively, and then transfer the transfer data displayed in the second page to the first server and also display the transfer data with the content in the first page (from the first server)

The Examiner further cited the Microsoft article as rendering obvious many of the above claim requirements. The Examiner did not cite any specific sections of the Microsoft article, which is several pages in length. The Microsoft article mentions that Active X is a software architecture that provides a foundation for software services, such as OLE, which is a technology for transferring and sharing information among applications. (Microsoft, pg. 1, par. 4) The

Microsoft article further mentions that if users downloading a page become frustrated because a page with a large component was taking too long to download, they could find Web content elsewhere. (Microsoft, pg. 2, par. 2).

Although the Microsoft article discusses ActiveX software which allows data to be transferred and shared among applications, nowhere does the above cited Microsoft article anywhere teach or suggest the specific claim requirements for sharing information by having the client computer download and display a first and second pages from a first and second servers, respectively, then transfer the transfer data displayed in the second page to the first server and also display the transfer data with the content in the first page (from the first server).

Nowhere do the cited articles, alone or in combination, anywhere teach, suggest or mention the specific combination of claim requirements that a client computer download two pages from two servers and then cause transfer data displayed in the second page (from a second server) to be displayed in a first page (from a first server) and also communicate that transfer data (in the second page from the second server) to the first server.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited art because the cited combination does not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Claims 2-6 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claim 1, which is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, claims 2-6 provide additional details and requirements on how the transfer data (displayed in the second page from the second server) is communicated to the first server and displayed in the first page from the first server. Because the cited references nowhere teach or suggest how to transfer and display data with respect to different pages from different servers as claimed, the additional requirements of these dependent claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Independent claim 9 concerns a system for transferring data from a first server through a client, and requires: a second server; a network interface allowing the second server to communicate with the client; program logic implemented in a computer readable memory capable of causing the second server to perform: (i) in response to a request, transmitting a first page to the client computer, wherein the first page activates a program in the client computer to

cause the client computer to transmit transfer data to the second server, wherein the client computer accesses the transfer data from a second page the client computer downloads and displays from the first server, and wherein the program further causes the client computer to display the transfer data from the second page with the content from the first page; and (ii) receiving the transfer data from the client computer.

Claim 9 is patentable over the cited references for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1. Claim 9 requires that a second server transmit a first page to a client computer that activates a program in the client computer to cause the client computer to download a second page from the first server that displays transfer data. As discussed with respect to claim 1, nowhere do the cited references anywhere disclose that transfer data from the second page (from the first server) is displayed with the content in a first page (from the second server) and that the second server receives the transfer data (from the first server).

As discussed, nowhere do the cited articles, alone or in combination, anywhere teach, suggest or mention the specific combination of claim requirements that a client computer download two pages from two servers and then cause transfer data displayed in the second page (from a first server) to be displayed with the content in a first page (from a second server) and also communicate that transfer data (in the second page from the first server) to the second server.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 9 is patentable over the cited art because the cited combination does not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Claims 10 and 11 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claim 9, which is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, claims 10 and 11 provide additional details and requirements on how the transfer data (displayed in the second page from the first server) is communicated to the second server and how the transfer data (from the first page) is displayed in the second page from the second server. Because the cited references nowhere teach or suggest how to transfer and display data with respect to different pages from different servers as claimed, the additional requirements of these dependent claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Independent claim 14 concerns a computer readable medium including a first page including content and code to activate a program, wherein the first page is transferred to a client computer from a first server, wherein the client computer is further capable of communicating with a second server, and wherein the first page causes the client computer to perform: displaying the content in the first page; activating the program to cause the client computer to transmit transfer data to the second server, wherein the client computer accesses the transfer data from a second page the client computer downloads and displays from the second server, and wherein the program further causes the client computer to display the transfer data from the second page with the content from the first page.

Claim 14 is patentable over the cited references for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1. Although the Microsoft article discusses ActiveX software which allows data to be transferred and shared among applications, nowhere does the above cited Microsoft article anywhere teach or suggest the specific claim requirements for sharing information by having the client computer download and display a first and second pages from a first and second servers, respectively, then transfer the transfer data displayed in the second page to the first server and also display the transfer data with the content in the first page (from the first server).

Nowhere do the cited articles, alone or in combination, anywhere teach, suggest or mention the specific combination of claim requirements that a client computer download two pages from two servers and then execute a program included in the first page to cause transfer data displayed in the second page (from a second server) to be displayed in a first page (from a first server) and also communicate that transfer data (in the second page from the second server) to the first server.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 14 is patentable over the cited art because the cited combination does not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Claims 15 and 16 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claim 14, which is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, claims 15 and 16 provide additional details and requirements on how the transfer data (displayed in the second page from the second server) is communicated to the first server and display the transfer data

(from the second page) in the first page from the first server. Because the cited references nowhere teach or suggest how to transfer and display data with respect to different pages from different servers as claimed, the additional requirements of these dependent claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-6, 9-11, and 14-16 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: November 30, 2004

By: _____
David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984